APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,224	11/26/2001	Adrian Conor Klein	MSFT-0672/158461.1	9650

41505 · 7590 03/28/2007
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER
RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/995,224	KLEIN ET·AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Laurie Ries .	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2007.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 November 2001 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   ˙ This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued

Examination, filed 7 February 2007, to the Original Application, filed 26 November 2001.

2.   Claims 1-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 12, and 21 are independent claims.

Request for Continued Examination

4.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7

February 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 7 February 2007 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Goodisman fails to teach that the recognizer
and helper objects are client side objects. The Office respectfully disagrees. While
Goodisman does not expressly teach that the linkify engine is embodied on the client
device, Goodisman does teach that the embodiment shown in Figure 3 in which the
linkify engine is located on a server is not meant as a limitation to the configuration of
the system and is provided merely for illustration purposes (See Goodisman, Page 5
paragraph 0050). Goodisman further teaches that it is well-known that the client and
server may exist on the same device (See Goodisman, Page 5, paragraph 0051). At
the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to
configure the linkify engine of Goodisman on the client device, providing the benefit of
reducing the amount of bandwidth required to process data between a client and a
server device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 10-12 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) in view of

Subramanian (U.S. Publication 2002/0123912 A1).

As per independent claims 1 and 12, Goodisman teaches a system and

method for providing associated links in content viewable by a computing browser-type

application capable of receiving and displaying content including receiving online

content by a computing application from a cooperating content server over a

communications network (See Goodisman, Page 3, paragraphs 0032-00330, a

recognizer, or pattern matcher, that cooperates with a linkify engine or helper object to

compare the content with a predefined list of key-phrases and/or syntactic rules for

recognizing key-phrase candidates. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

While Goodisman does not expressly teach that the linkify engine and pattern

matcher are embodied on the client device, Goodisman does teach that the

embodiment shown in Figure 3 in which the linkify engine and pattern matcher are

located on a server is not meant as a limitation to the configuration of the system and is

provided merely for illustration purposes (See Goodisman, Page 5 paragraph 0050).

Goodisman further teaches that it is well-known that the client and server may exist on

the same device (See Goodisman, Page 5, paragraph 0051). At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to configure the

linkify engine and pattern matcher of Goodisman on the client device, providing the

benefit of reducing the amount of bandwidth required to process data between a client

and a server device.

Goodisman does not teach expressly a helper object that does not cooperate

with any other content viewing application. Subramanian teaches a Match Maker,

equivalent to the helper object of the Instant Application, whose function is to parse the

content of the current page, group attributes to form structured objects, communicate

with the Rules Registry, and produce a set of contextually relevant advertisements (See

Subramanian, Page 7, paragraph 0102, and Page 10, paragraph 0133).

Goodisman and Subramanian are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of linking data.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to include the Match Maker of Subramanian with the system and method

for providing associated links of Goodisman. The motivation for doing so would have

been to affiliate links that are automatically determined to be relevant to the customer's

current interest on the Internet (See Subramanian, Page 1, paragraph 0002).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Subramanian with Goodisman for the

benefit of affiliating links that are automatically determined to be relevant to the

customer's current interest on the Internet to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 12.

As per dependent claim 2, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Goodisman also teaches at least one action handler, or targeting feature, to execute at least one pre-defined action related to the associated links. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053, and Page 7, paragraph 0056).

As per dependent claim 3, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Subramanian also teaches automatically updating the predefined list of key-phrases and/or syntactic rules (See Subramanian, Page 5, paragraph 0074). Goodisman and Subramanian are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of linking data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include automatic updating of the database of Subramanian with the system for providing associated links of Goodisman. The motivation for doing so would have been to access the latest data whenever the browser is used (See Subramanian, Page 5, paragraph 0074). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Subramanian with Goodisman for the benefit of accessing the latest data whenever the browser is used to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

As per dependent claim 4, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Goodisman also teaches that the computing application includes a content browser computing application. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per dependent claim 7, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 1 as described above. Goodisman also teaches that the associated links offer

features including additional associated links, which is included in the list of possible

features set forth in claim 7. (See Goodisman, Pages 3-4, paragraph 0037).

As per dependent claim 10, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 1 as described above. Goodisman also teaches that the computing browser-

type application resides on a client computer of a networked computer environment.

(See Goodisman, Figure 3, elements 42 and 48).

As per dependent claim 11, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 10 as described above. Goodisman also teaches that the received content is

received from at least one computer server of the networked computer environment.

(See Goodisman, Figure 3, element 44).

As per dependent claim 15, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 12 as described above. Goodisman also teaches executing the match true

associated links upon interaction from participating users, the interaction being realized

through at least one input from a user interface with the match true associated links.

(See Goodisman, Page 3, paragraphs 0035-0036, Page 4, paragraph 0038, and Page

7, paragraph 0059).

As per dependent claim 16, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 15 as described above. Goodisman also teaches aggregating content

associated with the executed associated link, the aggregated content including any of a

group including additional associated links, additional relevant content related to the

executed content, execution commands for search operations, and execution

commands to launch cooperating applications (See Goodisman, Page 3-4, paragraph

0037), and generating an interactive display pane, which is populated with the

aggregated content. (See Goodisman, Page 3-4, paragraph 0037).

As per dependent claim 17, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 12 as described above. Goodisman also teaches separating the received

online content into phrases and communicating the phrases to the recognizer, or pattern

matcher. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per dependent claim 18, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 12 as described above. Goodisman also teaches processing the phrases to

identify any words that are contained in the predefine list of associated links. (See

Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per dependent claim 19, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 12 as described above. Goodisman also teaches highlighting the match true

associated links such that they appear having a different color and/or format than

surrounding non-associated link content. (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per dependent claim 20, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 12 as described above. Goodisman also teaches a computer readable medium

having computer executable instructions for performing the steps in claim 12. (See

Goodisman, Page 7, paragraphs 0060 and 0062).

7.   Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) in view of Subramanian (U.S.

Publication 2002/0123912 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Smith

(U.S. Patent 6,222,537 B1).

As per dependent claims 5 and 6, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the

limitations of claim 1 as described above. Goodisman and Subramanian do not teach

expressly the inclusion of a first and second listener including a set of instructions to

monitor and be responsive to interaction with the computing application. Smith teaches

the use of event listener objects, which include a set of instructions to monitor and

interact with a computing application. (See Smith, Column 8, lines 23-32). Goodisman,

Subramanian and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor of accessing information online. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the event listener objects

of Smith with the method and system of providing associated links of Goodisman and

Subramanian. .The motivation for doing so would have been to be aware of events

triggered by user interaction. (See Smith, Column 8, lines 28-32). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to combine Smith with Goodisman and Subramanian for the benefit

of tracking user interaction to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 6.

8.   Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) in view of Subramanian (U.S.

Publication 2002/0123912 A1), as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of

Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647).

        As per dependent claims 8 and 9, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the

limitations of claim 7 as described above. Goodisman and Subramanian do not teach

expressly that the additional associated links are related to an underlying associated

link. Horowitz teaches additional associated links that are related to an underlying

associated link. (See Horowitz, Figure 5). Goodisman, Subramanian and Horowitz are

analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of dynamically

generating contextual links. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to include the additional associated links related to an

underlying associated link of Horowitz with the additional associated links of Goodisman

and Subramanian. The motivation for doing so would have been to generate new links

from the target document that may be available or relevant. (See Horowitz, Column 2,

lines 23-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Horowitz with

Goodisman and Subramanian for the benefit of providing additional relevant links to

obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 9.

9.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) in view of Subramanian (U.S.

Publication 2002/0123912 A1), as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of

Kippenhan (U.S. Publication 2002/0010769 A1).

As per dependent claim 13, Goodisman and Subramanian teach the limitations

of claim 12 as described above. Goodisman also teaches displaying the generated

processed content to participating users through a cooperating display device. (See

Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053, Figure 3, element 42, and Page 5, paragraph

0050). Goodisman and Subramanian do not teach expressly monitoring the activity of

the participating users with the match true associated links of generated processed

content to offer content associated with the associated links. Kippenhan teaches

monitoring user activity on a web browser. (See Kippenhan, Page 3, paragraph 0032).

Goodisman, Subramanian and Kippenhan are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor of accessing information online. At the time of the invention it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the

monitoring of user activity on the browser of Kippenhan with the method of providing

associated links of Goodisman and Subramanian. The motivation for doing so would

have been to identify and provide additional information about a given subject of interest

to a user. (See Kippenhan, Page 1, paragraph 0010). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Kippenhan with Goodisman and Subramanian for the benefit of

identifying and providing the user with additional information of interest to obtain the

invention as specified in claim 13.

10.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) in view of Subramanian (U.S.

Publication 2002/0123912 A1) and Kippenhan (U.S. Publication 2002/0010769 A1), as

applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 6,222,537 B1).

As per dependent claim 14, Goodisman, Subramanian and Kippenhan teach

the limitations of claim 13 as described above. Goodisman, Subramanian and

Kippenhan do not teach expressly the inclusion of a first and second listener including a

set of instructions to monitor and be responsive to interaction with the computing

application. Smith teaches the use of event listener objects, which include a set of

instructions to monitor and interact with a computing application. (See Smith, Column

8, lines 23-32). Goodisman, Subramanian, Kippenhan and Smith are analogous art

because they are from the same field of endeavor of accessing information online. At

the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to include the event listener objects of Smith with the method and system of

providing associated links of Goodisman, Subramanian and Kippenhan. The motivation

for doing so would have been to be aware of events triggered by user interaction. (See

Smith, Column 8, lines 28-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith

with Goodisman, Subramanian and Kippenhan for the benefit of tracking user

interaction to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

11.   Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1) in view of Subramanian (U.S.

Publication 2002/0123912 A1) and Baird (U.S. Publication 2003/0080986 A1).

As per independent claim 21, Goodisman teaches a system and method for

providing associated links in content viewable by a computing browser-type application

capable of receiving and displaying content including receiving online content by a

computing application from a cooperating content server over a communications

network (See Goodisman, Page 3, paragraphs 0032-00330, a recognizer, or pattern

matcher, that cooperates with a linkify engine or helper object to compare the content

with a predefined list of key-phrases and/or syntactic rules for recognizing key-phrase

candidates (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053), and an update engine on a

computing application incorporating associated links in online content (See Goodisman,

Claim 34).

While Goodisman does not expressly teach that the linkify engine and pattern

matcher are embodied on the client device, Goodisman does teach that the

embodiment shown in Figure 3 in which the linkify engine and pattern matcher are

located on a server is not meant as a limitation to the configuration of the system and is

provided merely for illustration purposes (See Goodisman, Page 5 paragraph 0050).

Goodisman further teaches that it is well-known that the client and server may exist on

the same device (See Goodisman, Page 5, paragraph 0051). At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to configure the

linkify engine and pattern matcher of Goodisman on the client device, providing the

benefit of reducing the amount of bandwidth required to process data between a client

and a server device.

Goodisman does not teach expressly a helper object that does not cooperate

with any other content viewing application. Subramanian teaches a Match Maker,

equivalent to the helper object of the Instant Application, whose function is to parse the

content of the current page, group attributes to form structured objects, communicate

with the Rules Registry, and produce a set of contextually relevant advertisements (See

Subramanian, Page 7, paragraph 0102, and Page 10, paragraph 0133).

Goodisman also does not teach communicating with an update server to obtain

data indicative of an updated associated link list. Baird teaches updating a list of links

upon the execution of a preconfigured event. (See Baird, Page 5, paragraph 0048).

Goodisman, Subramanian and Baird are analogous art because they are from

the same field of endeavor of linking data.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to include the Match Maker of Subramanian and the update engine of

Baird with the system and method for providing associated links of Goodisman. The

motivation for doing so would have been to affiliate links that are automatically

determined to be relevant to the customer's current interest on the Internet (See

Subramanian, Page 1, paragraph 0002) and to remove links which have become

outdated or are no longer available. (See Baird, Page 2, paragraph 0021). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Subramanian with Goodisman for the benefit of

affiliating links that are automatically determined to be relevant to the customer's current interest on the Internet and to remove links which have become outdated or are no longer available to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

As per dependent claim 22, Goodisman, Subramanian and Baird teach the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Goodisman also teaches modifying the existing predefined associated link lists to include data on the obtained associated link lists (See Goodisman, Page 6, paragraph 0053).

As per dependent claim 23, Goodisman, Subramanian and Baird teach the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Goodisman also teaches a computer readable medium having computer readable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 21. (See Goodisman, Page 7, paragraphs 0060 and 0062).

Conclusion

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

13.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Laurie Ries
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176